

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending. By this Response, claims 1, 3 and 7 are amended and claims 8 and 9 added. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

§112, First Paragraph

The Examiner rejects claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for not complying with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the features of claims 1 and 3, particularly, the claimed input/output unit, is not supported in the specification. Applicant respectfully submit that the input/output unit is supported by the specification.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has made general assumptions which are not correct and not supported by the description in the specification. Specifically, regarding Fig. 2, the Examiner states that the image capture system (referred to as “kiosk” by the Examiner) is the claimed input/output system. This is an incorrect assumption as clearly evidenced by the disclosure of the input/output device in applicant’s specification. For example, the input/output unit described on pages 2-5 refer to a detachable device that can either be an input device, output device or both. The input/output device is connected to an input/output interface of the image capture system. In context of embodiments described on pages 6-16, the input/output device refers to an additional drive, such as a printer, disk device

or other device, performing the functions of inputting or outputting images or performing both functions.

To clarify the claimed input/output device, claims 1, 3 and 7 have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended satisfy the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito, et al. (US 6,529,644) in view of Hoffman (COMPCOM '95) and Hoyt, et al. (US Publication 2001/0011262). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ito teaches a system that processes images acquired from a video camera or similar device. The system is configured to enable a user to print an image from a camera located on a system. See columns 3 through 4 and Figs. 1-4. In Ito, if the camera is connected to the system, a switch box selects the camera input. The switch box allows the camera and another external video device to be connected to the system. The switch box switches between the two external inputs. If another external video device is connected at the second input terminal 80, then the switch is moved to connect to the external video device at input terminal 80 (step S82). Thus, Ito provides a switching

mechanism that performs an automatic switching between two external input video devices depending on what terminal the device is connected to.

Nowhere does Ito teach or suggest, giving notification that input/output of an image by the input/output unit connected to said input/output interface is possible when the use verification command has been applied from said command input unit and said determination unit has determined that the input/output unit has been connected, and for getting notification that an input/output unit can be connected to said input/output interface once a determination unit has determined that the input/output unit has not been connected, as recited in claims 1, 3 and 7.

Further, Ito does not teach or suggest the use of a detachable device that may perform both input and output operations of image data. Thus, Ito does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a detachable input/output unit that is able to capture said image data and output said image data, as recited in claims 7, 8 and 9.

Furthermore, Hoffman and Hoyt fail to make up for Ito's deficiencies. Hoyt teaches a system in which a user is able to have their picture taken and processed. The user can obtain a printed photograph of the image taken.

The Office Action alleges that "Hoyt discloses an 'attract loop' to output an audio/video presentation to demonstrate an operation and/or benefits of the present booth to attract or lure customers. As such, notification would be given that an external device can be attached when one isn't detected to be

attached. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have added a notification that an input/output unit can be connected to said input/output interface when said determination unit has determined that the input/output unit has not been connected in order to provide visual instructions to the user on how to use Ito's invention as taught by Hoyt." Applicant respectfully submits that the "attract loop" is merely a presentation of the abilities of the system it is implemented within. Nowhere does Hoyt teach or suggest the attract loop generates a notification as claimed by applicants.

Further, as noted above, neither Ito nor Hoyt teach generating a notification as recited in claims 1, 3 and 7. Thus, due to the absent of teachings within the references, one of ordinary skill would not be motivated to combine Ito and Hoyt's teachings to achieve applicant's claimed features.

Finally, Hoffman is provided merely to disclose use of a hot plug such as the IEEE 1394. Hoffman does not teach or suggest the features deficient in Ito and Hoyt noted above.

Therefore, in view of the above, applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ito, Hoyt and Hoffman fail to teach each and every feature of the claims as required. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of the references to achieve applicant's invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-9 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Michael R. Cammarata, #39,491

MRC/CJB:cb
0905-0242P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

Attachment(s)